

**REMARKS**

Claims 19-25 and 27-38 are pending in the application, of which Claims 19, 22 and 23 are written in independent form. Claims 19-21 and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Discolo et al. (U.S. PGPUB 2001/0054072) in view of Wells et al. (U.S. Patent 6,078,820). Claim 38 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Discolo in view of Wells and further in view of Cronin (U.S. PGPUB 2003/0100336). Claims 22-25 and 28-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Tarkiainen et al. (U.S. PGPUB 2001/0041560) in view of Godfrey et al. (U.S. PGPUB 2003/0018816).

Please amend Claims 19, 22 and 33 as set forth herein. No new matter has been added.

Regarding the rejection of independent Claim 19 under §103(a), the Examiner alleges that Discolo in view of Wells renders the claim unpatentable. Discolo discloses generating meeting requests and group scheduling from a mobile device; and, Wells discloses real-time SMS application messaging using an SMSC-linked server.

Claim 19 recites, in part, that the data format of the schedule is converted into a data format of a schedule-recordable SMS message. As disclosed on at least page 13, lines 13-15 of the specification, the only reasonable interpretation of “schedule-recordable SMS message” is a SMS message that is in a format that mobile terminals that have received the schedule-recordable SMS message can directly record the received schedule message in their scheduler. The Examiner alleges that Wells teaches these features. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Wells discloses that information is sent using an SMS message. No conversion is taught or disclosed by Wells. Further, Wells does not teach or disclose that its SMS messages are schedule-recordable SMS messages; the messages in Wells are standard SMS messages that cannot be directly recorded in a scheduler. The SMS message of Wells is not and cannot be

equated with the schedule-recordable SMS message recited in Claim 19 of the present application. Discolo does not cure the defects of Wells.

In addition, Claim 19 has been amended herein to recite, in part, wherein the data format of the schedule-recordable SMS message is in a format of a message that can be directly recorded as a schedule item in the scheduler. Wells discloses that the appointment information is sent to the PMC/WWW server using a DESC-encoded SMS message. It is respectfully submitted that the SMS message of Wells is a message converted into a DESC format, and the SMS message includes the appointment information. However, the data format of the schedule-recordable SMS message of the claims of the present application is in a format that can be directly recorded in the scheduler. That is, the message of Wells is encoded into a specific format in order to be transmitted to the server, but Wells does not teach or disclose a message converted into the data format of the schedule-recordable SMS message that can be directly recorded in the scheduler, as recited in the claims of the present application.

Based on at least the foregoing, withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 19 under §103(a) is respectfully requested.

Regarding the rejection of independent Claims 22 and 23 under §103(a), the Examiner alleges that Tarkiainen in view of Godfrey renders the claims unpatentable. Tarkiainen discloses a method for transmission of messages; and, Godfrey discloses a system and method for pushing calendar event messages from a host system to a mobile data communication device.

Claim 22 has been amended to recite, “A schedule recording method in a mobile terminal having a short message service (SMS) message reception function and a schedule function, the method comprising the steps of: upon receiving an SMS message, determining, by a controller, whether the received SMS message is a schedule-recordable SMS message; if the received SMS message is a schedule-recordable SMS message, determining, by the controller, whether a

schedule recording key is input; and if the schedule recording key is input, recording a schedule information of the schedule-recordable SMS message in a scheduler.”

Each of Claims 22 and 23 recite, in part, a schedule-recordable SMS message. As in Claim 19, a schedule-recordable SMS message is a SMS message that is in a format that mobile terminals that have received the schedule-recordable SMS message can directly record the received schedule message in their scheduler.

Tarkiainen discloses a messaging system that includes messages. Godfrey discloses attaching a calendar item to an email. The combination of Tarkiainen and Godfrey would only produce a message with a calendar item attached thereto. A message with a calendar item attached thereto of the combination of Tarkiainen and Godfrey is not and cannot be equated with the schedule-recordable SMS message recited in Claims 22 and 23 of the present application.

In addition, Tarkiainen discloses that a transmitter generates a message including an alarm using a calendar application, transfers the generated message to a recipient, and a device of the recipient displays the message. In other words, Tarkiainen merely discloses displaying the received message on a display of the device using the calendar application. Tarkiainen does not teach or disclose recording the schedule information of the schedule-recordable SMS message in the scheduler, as recited in amended Claim 22 of the present application.

In the claims of the present application invention, when a group has a common schedule, the schedule information transmitted from the SMS message can be directly recorded in the scheduler, thereby conveniently recording the schedule in the scheduler with no need to individually input the scheduled event.

Based on at least the foregoing, withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 22 and 23 under §103(a) is respectfully requested.

Independent Claims 19, 22 and 23 are believed to be in condition for allowance. Without conceding the patentability per se of dependent Claims 20, 21, 24, 25 and 27-38, these are likewise believed to be allowable by virtue of their dependence on their respective independent claims. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of dependent Claims 20, 21, 24, 25 and 27-38, is respectfully requested.

Accordingly, all of the claims pending in the Application, namely, Claims 19-25 and 27-38, are believed to be in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference or personal interview would facilitate resolution of any remaining matters, the Examiner may contact Applicants' attorney at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,



Paul J. Farrell  
Reg. No. 33,494  
Attorney for Applicants

THE FARRELL LAW FIRM, LLP  
290 Broadhollow Road, Suite 210 E  
Melville, New York 11747  
Tel: (516) 228-3565  
Fax: (516) 228-8475